

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Currently, claims 1 through 36 remain pending in the present application, including independent claims 1 and 14. In the Office Action, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Nielsen and under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Nielsen in view of Johnson. As now amended, however, it is believed that the claims patentably define over Nielsen alone or in combination with Johnson.

For instance, as now amended, claims 1 and 14 both require that the discrete droplets or the topical compositions form a repetitive pattern on the surface of the sheet.

In comparison, Nielsen does not disclose a tissue product where a composition has been applied to a sheet in a repetitive pattern. In Nielsen, for instance, the additive compositions are applied to a sheet material using a decompressive spray of a compressed fluid. Nielsen states that a "uniform spray pattern" can be used during spraying. A uniform spray pattern, however, does not produce a repetitive pattern.

For instance, as stated in the present application, one problem posed with spray processes is that manufacturers often find it difficult to control the amount of chemical and the placement or pattern of the chemical that is applied to the tissue ply. Thus, a frequent problem with the spray atomization technique is that a large amount of over-spray is generated. Additionally, lack of control over a spray process also affects the uniformity of application to the tissue web.

In this regard, although Nielsen is directed to better controlling a spray process, Nielsen does not disclose or suggest applying the additive composition according to a repetitive pattern. In comparison, since the additive compositions are applied according to the presently pending claims using a non-impact printing process, application of the composition to the tissue webs can be carefully controlled so that a repetitive pattern can form.

In addition, Applicants submit that Johnson does nothing to cure the deficiencies of Nielsen. Johnson, for instance, is directed to applying a slurry including an abrasion-

resistant grit to the upper surface of a web and then applying a secondary web of cellulosic fibers over the grit to form a three layer overlay paper for incorporation into a decorative laminate. After the overlay paper is formed, one surface of the overlay paper is printed or coated using any known contact or non-contact printing or coating method. In this regard, Johnson indicates that non-contact methods include inkjet printing, curtain coating, spray coating, electrostatic coating, etc. Johnson does not teach or suggest, however, that a spray application method of an additive composition using a decompressive spray of a compressed fluid would in any way be interchangeable with an inkjet printer. Johnson is directed to a printing process using conventional inks in a different field and application. As such, Applicants submit that the presently pending claims patentably define over Nielsen either alone or in combination with Johnson.

In the Office Action, the claims were also objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112. Although Applicants do not agree or acquiesce in the rejection, the claims have been amended as requested by the Examiner in order to expedite prosecution.

In summary, Applicants submit that the present application is in complete condition for allowance. Should any issues remain after consideration of this response, however, then Examiner Fortuna is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned at his convenience.

Please charge any additional fees required by this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 04-1403.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Timothy A. Cassidy  
Reg. No. 38,024  
P.O. Box 1449  
Greenville, SC 29602  
(864) 271-1592  
(864) 233-7342 - Fax

February 27, 2007  
Date